REMARKS

In the previous response, it was contended that the cited reference does not show an arrayed waveguide grating. Rather than contend that it does, it is asserted in the final rejection that the Applicants have argued limitations from the specification that are not in the claims.

However, it was the Applicants' intent to simply define what an arrayed waveguide grating is. But, perhaps, it should have sufficed to say that the cited reference does not show anything that could constitute an arrayed waveguide grating. An arrayed waveguide grating is a term of art. It cannot be applied without proper consideration of what one skilled in the art would consider to be an arrayed waveguide grating. What is shown in the present application is an arrayed waveguide grating. What is shown in the reference is not an arrayed waveguide grating and nothing in the reference suggests it is.

Therefore, the maintenance of the rejection, based on a reference that does not show an arrayed waveguide grating, is untenable. The characteristics of an arrayed waveguide grating are set forth in the first page of the specification and would be well known to one skilled in the art. It is not any grating, but, rather, a grating that is called an arrayed waveguide grating. It includes an input waveguide, an output waveguide, and an array of waveguides of different length. This array of waveguides of different lengths connect between the input and the output waveguides. Nothing of the sort is shown in the cited reference and nothing that could possibly constitute an arrayed waveguide grating is cited there. The best evidence of this is the fact that Dr. Deagan did not ever call anything that he did an arrayed waveguide grating. For example, in the Abstract, he says that what he has could be used in an arrayed waveguide grating. This clearly indicates that what is shown there was never intended to be an arrayed waveguide grating itself. Logically, it would make no sense to use an arrayed waveguide grating in an arrayed waveguide grating.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/22/06

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation